REMARKS

Independent claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 13-15, 21, 22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, 45-47, and 48-50 are currently pending in the application. Claims 48-50 have been added. Claims 1, 32, and 41 have been amended. No claims have been canceled herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, 21-22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 to Beatty et al. ("Beatty") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg"). In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 32, and 41. Beatty discloses a system and method for debugging software to control a digital signal processor (DSP) and a general-purpose computer employing either the system or the method. Beatty further discloses controlling a real DSP or an emulated DSP. Beatty discloses an architecture database, storable on a storage device of the general purpose computer that contains a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of DSPs, the system thereby allowing the user to select a particular DSP from the database. Beatty allows the user to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced.

Weinberg discloses a visual website analysis program. The program is implemented as a collection of software components for providing a variety of features for facilitating an analysis and management of web sites and website content. A mapping component scans a web site over a network connection and builds a site map which graphically depicts URLs and links of the site.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing a visualization of an underlying architecture of a software system within a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least two distinguishing features of claim 1, namely: 1) performing a graphical operation on the web page for dynamic visualization of the graphical elements indicative of the underlying architecture of the software system; and 2) that the dynamic visualization provides a graphical

representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system.

Applicant respectfully submits that Beatty is directed to solving a different type of problem and fails to address at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 1. Referring to column 2, lines 5-14 of the background section, Beatty states that:

> Conventionally, the *values of the registers* and memory of the machine are ***textually*** displayed on the display of the personal computer such that a user may examine the values as the program is being operated on the emulated DSP. . . . the debugging is a brute force process where the user ***pictures in his mind*** the state of the machine that correlates with the operation of the machine at a particular stage and throughout the application of the program. The user, then, compares the ***picture in mind*** with the ***textual information*** provided and makes adjustments to the code, if necessary. (emphasis added)

Beatty makes a distinction between the graphical portion (e.g., a picture in the mind) and the values in the registers (textual information) which were already available without the benefit of Beatty, and attempts to address the issue that a user must picture in his mind the architecture of the DSP. Implicit in the passage cited above is the fact that updating the states of registers does not constitute a visualization. Accordingly, in column 6, lines 23-26, Beatty discloses displaying " an architecture of a particular DSP selected from the database in a window…the architecture includes a *graphical device layout* and *at least one field corresponding to a register* of the DSP." Consequently, Beatty reinforces the distinction between the graphical elements and the textual elements (the register values) and implements its solution of combining a graphical depiction of the DSP architecture with the already-available non-graphical register information.

Applicant respectfully submits that the visualization in Beatty remains static after it is displayed. With reference to Figures 4-11, it can be seen that the graphical elements in Beatty do not change as instructions are executed. Instead, only the non-graphical information of the values contained in the registers is updated. For example, from Figure 7 to Figure 8, the graphical device layout remains the same while four register values change from an undefined state to having defined values. Since the non-graphical register information does not constitute a visualization, the visualization of the graphical elements is static. For similar reasons, Beatty also fails to teach the feature wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system.

In contrast, in the invention as claimed in independent claim 1, a graphical operation is performed that results in a dynamic visualization. For example, in various embodiments of the claimed invention (e.g., Figure 5 of the application as originally filed), graphical elements are highlighted and lines are drawn between architectural elements to show collaborative interactions. Further, to emphasize that the graphical operation is distinct from the original rendering of the graphical elements, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 32, and 41 to so state.

Weinberg is focused on mapping website architecture and fails to cure the deficiencies of Beatty noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Weinberg and Beatty and respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 32 is directed to a computer-readable medium having stored thereon sequences of instructions. Applicant respectfully submits that, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 32 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 32 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 41 is directed to an application service provider (ASP) system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system. Applicant respectfully submits that, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 41 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 32 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 depend from and further restrict claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 distinguish over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends from and further restricts independent claim 33 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33, dependent claim 34 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and

Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 34 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21-26 depend from and further restrict claim 41 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1, dependent claims 21-26 distinguish over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 21-26 be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those given with respect to independent claims 1, 32, and 41, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 48-50 also distinguish over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Ross T. Robinson/
Ross T. Robinson
Registration No.: 47,031
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant